



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/690,159

10/17/2000

Oleg B. Rashkovskiy

INTL-0472-US (P10019)

2744

21906

7590

10/19/2006

TROP PRUNER & HU, PC
1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750
HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631

EXAMINER

VU, NGOC K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/690,159

Applicant(s)

RASHKOVSKIY, OLEG B.

Examiner

Ngoc K. Vu

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 44-51, 54-56 and 58-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 44-51, 54-56 and 58-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/31/2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 44-51, 54-56, and 58-74 have been considered and are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 54-56 and 58-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows. Claim 54 defines a medium for storing instructions. Claim 54 is not directed to a practical application that produces a useful, tangible and concrete result. Accordingly, claims 54-56 and 58-63 are non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2623

6. Claims 44-51, 54-56, and 58-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong et al. (US 7,017,173 B1) in view of Zigmond et al. (US 6,698,020 B1).

Regarding claim 44, Armstrong teaches a method comprising receiving content and at least two advertisements on a content receiver (e.g., set top box) (col. 3, lines 4-18; col. 3-4, lines 65-2; col. 4, lines 40-47; figures 1-3); storing advertisements in a cache (storage) coupled to said content receiver (col. 13, lines 24-34), in response to detecting a change from the one mode of display to another mode of display (e.g., pausing or stopping the presentation of the program), displaying one or more selected advertisements for as long as the other mode of display continues, said change from said one mode of display to said other mode of display in response to an action taken by a user of said content receiver (upon receiving stop or pause command from a user, the set top box displays advertisement information – see col. 4, lines 47-51; col. 5-6, lines 66-7; col. 6, lines 57-60; col. 11, lines 29-49; col. 13, lines 28-34). Armstrong does not explicitly disclose storing the content, selecting a stored advertisement based on a content characteristic that is specified by an advertisement provider, and displaying the retrieved content in one mode of display. However, Zigmond discloses storing video programming and advertisements in a storage 86 of viewer's device and later making the video programming available for display to a viewer (col. 15, lines 26-34). Zigmond further discloses selecting a stored advertisement based on advertisement parameter that is specified by an advertiser/provider (see col. 11, lines 31-42; col. 12, lines 15-18 and 33-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the system of Armstrong by storing the content and displaying the retrieved content, and selecting a stored advertisement based on advertisement parameter that is specified by an advertiser/provider as disclosed by Zigmond in order to locally playback the

video programming and effectively tailor advertisements to the interests and needs of the viewers.

Regarding claim 54, Armstrong teaches a medium for storing instruction that, if executed, enable a processor-based system (within set top box – figures 1-3) to receive content and at least two advertisements on a content receiver (e.g., set top box) (col. 3, lines 4-18; col. 3-4, lines 65-2; col. 4, lines 40-47; figures 1-3); store advertisements in a cache (storage) coupled to said content receiver (col. 13, lines 24-34), in response to detecting a switch from the one mode of display to another mode of display (e.g., pausing or stopping the presentation of the program), display one or more selected advertisements for as long as the other mode of display continues, said switch from said one mode of display to said other mode of display initiated by a user's use of the content receiver (upon receiving stop or pause command from a user, the set top box displays advertisement information – see col. 4, lines 47-51; col. 5-6, lines 66-7; col. 6, lines 57-60; col. 11, lines 29-49; col. 13, lines 28-34). Armstrong does not explicitly disclose storing the content, selecting a stored advertisement based on a content characteristic that is specified by an advertisement provider, and displaying the retrieved content in one mode of display. However, Zigmond discloses storing video programming and advertisements in a storage 86 of viewer's device and later making the video programming available for display to a viewer (col. 15, lines 26-34). Zigmond further discloses selecting a stored advertisement based on advertisement parameter that is specified by an advertiser/provider (see col. 11, lines 31-42; col. 12, lines 15-18 and 33-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the system of Armstrong by storing the content and displaying the retrieved content, and selecting a stored advertisement based on advertisement parameter that is specified by an advertiser/provider as disclosed by

Zigmond in order to locally playback the video programming and effectively tailor advertisements to the interests and needs of the viewers.

Regarding claims 45 and 55, Armstrong as modified by Zigmond further discloses that the advertiser may specify a particular advertisement to be shown during a particular program is broadcast. The particular advertisement is selected according to a particular program being viewed based on content rating (see Zigmond: col. 12, lines 15-18 and 47-51; col. 13, lines 48-51).

Regarding claims 46 and 56, Armstrong as modified by Zigmond further discloses comparing the content ratings of the advertisement specified by the advertiser to content rating of video programming being viewed (see Zigmond: col. 12, lines 15-18; col. 13, lines 48-57).

Regarding claim 47, Armstrong as modified by Zigmond further discloses selecting an advertising based on subject matter specified by the advertisement provider (see Zigmond: col. 12, lines 15-18 and 60-62).

Regarding claims 48-49 and 58-59, Armstrong as modified by Zigmond further discloses the subject matter of the television program may be identified using the descriptions in the electronic program database 81, by monitoring the contents of the closed captioning information that is broadcast with the video and audio portions of the television program (see Zigmond: col. 13, lines 1-6).

Regarding claims 50 and 60, Armstrong as modified by Zigmond further discloses storing a variety of content types (digital encoded video programming and/or analog version of the video programming feed) and allowing any one of the content type to be selected for play at any time (see Zigmond: col. 15, lines 28-34).

Regarding claims 61 and 62, Armstrong as modified by Zigmond further teaches receiving interruption instructions (i.e., triggering) over a channel that if executed enable the

Art Unit: 2623

system to monitor for criteria that determines when content is able to be interrupted (see Zigmond: col. 15, lines 37-39).

Regarding claim 64, Armstrong discloses a system (figures 1-3) comprising:

a receiver (142) receive content and at least two advertisements (col. 3, lines 4-18; col. 3-4, lines 65-2; col. 4, lines 40-47; figures 1-3); a cache (storage within set top box 142) coupled to the receiver, to store advertisements (col. 13, lines 24-34); an interface, in the receiver (142), in response to detecting user-initiated stop of the one mode of display of content (e.g., pausing or stopping the presentation of the program), display one or more selected advertisements for as long as the one mode of display is stopped, displaying one or more selected advertisements for as long as the other mode of display continues, said change from said one mode of display to said other mode of display in response to an action taken by a user of said content receiver (upon receiving stop or pause command from a user, the set top box displays advertisement information – see col. 4, lines 47-51; col. 5-6, lines 66-7; col. 6, lines 57-60; col. 11, lines 29-49; col. 13, lines 28-34). Armstrong does not explicitly disclose storing the content, selecting a stored advertisement based on a content characteristic that is specified by an advertisement provider, and displaying the retrieved content in one mode of display. However, Zigmond discloses storing video programming and advertisements in a storage 86 of viewer's device and later making the video programming available for display to a viewer (col. 15, lines 26-34). Zigmond further discloses selecting a stored advertisement based on advertisement parameter that is specified by an advertiser/provider (see col. 11, lines 31-42; col. 12, lines 15-18 and 33-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the system of Armstrong by storing the content and displaying the retrieved content, and selecting a stored advertisement based on advertisement parameter that is specified by an advertiser/provider as disclosed by Zigmond in order to locally

Art Unit: 2623

playback the video programming and effectively tailor advertisements to the interests and needs of the viewers.

Regarding claim 65, Armstrong discloses the system is a television receiver (see figures 1-3).

Regarding claim 66-68, Armstrong as modified by Zigmond teaches receiving interruption instructions (i.e., triggering) over a channel that if executed enable the system to monitor for criteria that determines when content is able to be interrupted. The system further comprises a device (83) that parses content from instructions for inserting a selected advertisement and parses instructions for how to store the content and advertisements (see Zigmond: col. 15, lines 37-39; col. 11, lines 31-49).

Regarding claim 70, Armstrong as modified by Zigmond further discloses that the advertiser may specify a particular advertisement to be shown during a particular program is broadcast. The particular advertisement is selected according to a particular program being viewed based on content rating (see Zigmond: col. 12, lines 15-18 and 47-51; col. 13, lines 48-51).

Regarding claim 71, Armstrong as modified by Zigmond further discloses selecting an advertising based on subject matter specified by the advertisement provider (see col. 12, lines 15-18 and 60-62).

Regarding claims 72-73, Armstrong teaches detecting a pause in the user of the content and resuming the user of the content (see col. 4, lines 47-51; col. 5-6, lines 66-7; col. 6, lines 57-60; col. 11, lines 29-49; col. 13, lines 28-34).

Claim 74, Armstrong teaches detecting a change from one mode to another mode of display such as changing from playing the video program to pause/stop presentation of the video program (see col. 4, lines 47-51; col. 5-6, lines 66-7; col. 6, lines 57-60; col. 11, lines 29-

Art Unit: 2623

49; col. 13, lines 28-34). Armstrong does not explicitly teach the content or video programming is game. Official Notice is taken that video programming including game in distributing system is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Armstrong by providing game as video programming in order to effectively enhance television interactive service.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoc K. Vu whose telephone number is 571-272-7306. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Ngoc K. Vu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2623

October 16, 2006